Plain Dealing
WITH THE
PRESBYTERIANS,
By Way of ANSWER
TO
A Letter from a Gentleman
OF
A Member of PARLIAMENT
CONCERNING
TOLERATION

In a Letter to a Friend.

Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that Men should do to you, do you even so to them. For this is the Law and the Prophets. S. Matth. 7. 12.

Because ye have said——for, we have made lies our Refuge, and under Falshood have we hid our selves: Therefore—— the hail shall sweep away the Refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding-place. Isai. 28. 15. with V. 17.

O magna vis Veritatis! quæ contra hominum ingenia, calliditatem, solertiam, contráque fictas omnium insidias, facilè se per seipsam defendit. *Cicero.*

Printed in the Year M DCC III.

Plain Dealing

WITH THE

PRESBYTERIANS.

To the Reader,

I Know that several Papers, on this Subject, are gone Abroad already; yet I cannot think that they ought to prevent the Publication of this, *which contains divers Particulars yet untouch'd by* Others. *Variety, in a case of this Nature and Importance, can neither be improper nor useless; but rather serve to give a fuller View of the* Matter *in Debate between* Us *and the* Presbyterians, *to Justifie the* Equity *of Our* Cause, *and to stop, if possible, the Mouths of the* Oppofers.

TOLERATION

BRITISH MUSEUM

Printed in the Year M DCC III.

SIR,

THE Fear of granting a *Toleration* to the Epiſcopal Clergy, and thoſe of their Perſwaſion, has ſo alarm'd the Adverſe Party, as if *Hannibal* were at their Gates, and they in danger to be Ruin'd; and their unreaſonable Suſpicion, or rather rooted Malice, hath ſet them a working againſt us, not only ſecretly, as Moles under Ground, by buzzing and whiſpering into the Ears of the Members of Parliament, a long Train of falſe Stories and miſchievous Inventions, which were never thought of; but openly and avowedly alſo in their Pulpits and Pamphlets, by Invectives and Threats againſt the Promoters, as well as Deſirers of a Toleration, beſtowing upon them the blackeſt Epithets; as may be ſeen, particularly in the *Three-fold-Cord* for ſecuring Presbytrie. May you not juſtly wonder, that they, who were ſo great Advocats for a Toleration, ſome years ago, and accepted it as a Favour valuable above all their Earthly Comforts, as they word it in their Addreſſe to K. J. 7. ſhould now ſo bitterly oppoſe it in our Caſe at this time? and, that what they called the *doing of the Lord*, crying, *Grace Grace unto it*, they ſhould call now the working of the *wicked One?* Is not this partial and diſingenuous dealing; *divers Weights and divers Meaſures*? A very unaccountable Divinity, which Converts that into a Sin now, which was formerly a *Religious Duty*, the Parity of Reaſon for granting a *Toleration* being far ſtronger on our ſide now, then it was on their ſide then. It ſeems theſe People Entertain a ſingular Principle, not owned by others, That there are ſome *Providential Truths*, which vary according to Circumſtances of times and Perſons. But, by my Anſwers to all that is ſaid in the Gentlemans Letter to a Member of Parliament, (a particular Conſideration of every Paragraph whereof you are pleaſed to Require,) I hope it ſhall appear to every Judicious and unbyaſſed Reader, That a *Toleration* is as Lawfull and neceſſary to us in the time of *Presbetry* (if not more) as it was to them in the days of *Epiſcopacy*.

This Author begins his Reaſonings, page 3. with a Tragical Out-cry, That, *To grant a Toleration were to Eſtabliſh a Schiſm, which is both a Sin and a Judgement*. To ſeparate from a duly Conſtitute Church (as theirs never was) Govern'd by Lawful, Cannonical Biſhops and Presbyters, and where nothing unlawful is Required as a Condition of Communion with it, is ſuch a prolifick Judicial Sin, as beſides its other Mule-Effects, ſeldom

miſſeth

misseth to Terminate in *Heresie*. And had the *Presbyterians*, as good Christians, Reflected seriously upon the great Duties of Peace and Unity and the dangerous Sin of Shism, it might have been Reasonably expected they would not have so Factiously and Furiously Divided from us, in the Former Reigns, as they did, to the great Disturbance both of Church and State, and hazard of our *Holy Religion*: much less that they would have Treated so inhumanly the Lawfully ordained Ministers thereof at this last Revolution: there being no Cause for such Schismatical and Barbarous practices. For he fairly acknowledges page 3. that the Doctrine, Worship, Sacraments and Church-Censures, are the same that were professed and performed under *Prelacy*; and if so, how can they justify their Separating from us, and turning us out of our Offices and Livings? thus, unwarrily but truly, he fixeth the Schism upon his own Party, who alone are justly Chargeable with it: *Great is the Power of Truth and it will prevail.* Nor will it avail him to say, they were straithed in their Consciences upon the Account of *Episcopacy*, a Government most Ancient and agreeable to *Apostolical practic*; For, as I think, there are few or none, in their Right Wits, that will assert the Unlawfullness of it, so, I know, 'tis impossible for them ever to demonstrat it. It is manifest then, this new Sect of *Presbyterians* have made the Schism, and the guilt and blame of it lyes at their Door, they being marked out not only as Schismaticks from us of the Episcopal Perswasion, but also from the Churches of *Presbyterial Constitution*; for they have swarved from the *First Reformers* in *Scotland*, and from the *Reformed Churches* of *France*, *Holland*, *Swiss* and *Geneve*, laying aside their Rites in Worship, their Forms and Offices for Administration of Sacraments, their Liturgies and Books of Common-Prayer, yea from their own Directory it self.

It is therefore just and necessarie, that a *Toleration* be Granted to the *Episcopal* Ministers, and the Numerous Laicks of their Perswasion, being the far greater and more considerable part of the Kingdom, Especially considering that the Terms of Communion with the *Presbyterians* are such, as neither the *Clergy-Men*, nor *Lay-Men* can in Conscience Embrace. This is a downright Contradiction to that in the Gentleman's Letter, page 3d. where it is said, *this Church Imposes no Sinfull Terms of Communion*; but yet, that such Terms are Required and Imposed, will appear by the Following Instances, as to what concerns either the *Episcopal-Clergy* or Laity in this Matter.

And *1mo.* As to the *Clergy*, The Presbyterians holding Episcopacy to be a Popish and Antichristian Hierarchy, sinful, and the cause of much Sin and Misery in the Land, as may be seen in the Printed Acts of their Assemblies for publick Fasts, do therefore require of Episcopal Ministers, whom they assume into a share of their Government, that they declare

their

their Grief and Sorrow for having served under Prelacy. Now how can any Man in Conscience submit to this, who is Convinc'd that an Imparity of Office-bearers in the Church is clearly pointed out in the *Sacred Scriptures* of the *New Testament*, and that the true Government which Christ did institute and leave in his Church, and which has been continu'd from the Apostles in the succeeding Ages thereof, consists in a Subordination of Church-Men to their Superiors the Bishops, who have Power and Authority to Ordain and Govern them, according to the Laws of the *Lord Jesus Christ*; He that yeilds to this, as he renounces his Perswasion, so he Condemnes the Antient Bishops in the first Ages of the Church, who were Eminent Propagators of, and Martyrs for the Faith of *Jesus Christ*.

On the other hand, they must own their *Kirk Government*, consisting of a Parity of Ministers & Seculars to be the only Government instituted by Christ in his *Church*, and that they shall adhere to it all the days of their Life. This is a gross imposing upon our Consciences, who very well know, that this Form was devised by *Calvin* at *Geneva* (as the Pious and Learn'd Mr. *Hooker* in his Admirable Preface to his Ecclesiastick Polity tells us at length.) The said *Calvin* being once Baniſh'd that City, and afterwards Re-call'd by a full Senate of 200 Persons; and considering how gross a thing it was for Wise and Grave Men of his Quality to live as Tenants at will with such a Multitude; For remedy of this Inconveniency, he told them, That, if he did become their Teacher again, they must admit a compleat Form of Discipline which they and their Pastors should be Sworn to observe for ever after. This at last they yeilded to, and so an Ecclesiastick Court was set up, consisting of Ministers as perpetual Judges therein, and of the People to be annually chosen as Judges with them. This Device (saith that Author) I see not how the wisest in that time living could have bettered, if we consider what the Estate of *Geneva* did then require; But, (saith he) Wise Men are Men, and the Truth is Truth: What *Calvin* did for the Establishment of that Form, seemeth more Commendable, than what he did for the Countenancing it. The Love he had to his own Counsel and Device excited him to espy, if he could find in the whole Scripture of God any thing which might breed at least a probable Opinion of Likely-hood, that Divine Authority was the same way somewhat inclineable: And all that *Calvin*'s Wit was able to draw from thence, by sifting the very outmost Sentence and Syllable, is no more, but that there are certain Speeches, that to him did seem to insinuat, but never one necessarly to inforce these things.

This being, as said is, The Original of Presbytrie, how can they require us, To own it as the True and only Government of the Church of Christ, and that we shall constantly adhere to it, and never again comply with Prelacy, tho' it were Re-established? The Great *Calvin*, its Founder, never intertain'd such High Thoughts of this New Model, as (for its sake) to Disparage

Episcopacy

Episcopacy, and exclude it out of the Church of God. That he never quarelled the Order, Dignity, and Function of Bishops, but only their Opposition to the intended Reformation at that time, they refusing to depart from the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and Dependence upon the Pope, is manifest from many Passages in his Writings; I shall Cite one for all, which he delivers in his own and Brethren's Name, *Talem si nobis Hierarchiam exhibeant, in qua sic emineant Episcopi ut Christo subesse non recusent, at ab illo tanquam unico Capite pendeant, & ad ipsum referantur, &c. tum vero nulle non Anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt, qui non eam reverenter summaque obedientia observant. Calvin: de Necessit: Eccles. Reformanda*, Cited and approv'd by *Chamier de Membris Eccles: lib. 4. Cap: 1.* If they would, saith he, Give vnto us such an Hierarchie, wherein the Bishops shall so Rule, as that they refuse not to submit themselves to Christ, that they depend upon Him as their only Head, refer all to Him, and Govern by his Laws, *&c.* Then surely, if their shall be any that will not submit themselves to that Hierarchy reverently, and with the greatest Obedience, I confess there is no *Anathema* of which they are not worthy. Such a severe Sentence should have weight with the true Disciples and followers of so Wise, so Good and Learn'd a Man.

2*do.* They require the Episcopal Ministers to Sign and Subscribe the *Westminster* Confession of Faith, as the Confession of their own Faith, which they stedfastly believe, and that the whole Doctrine in every Article and Proposition in it, is the true Doctrine of the Gospel. Now this Confession being Compil'd by Men, and containing in it many contraverted Doctrines, cannot be supos'd to be of infallible Verity, and therefore not impos'd as our Faith, to which we are bound to give full Assent and Consent: A Honour and Reverence which we owe only to the *Sacred Scriptures* of *Truth*, and the Ancient Symbol, compos'd either by the Apostles themselves, or Apostolick Men, as *Calvin* acknowledgeth in his Institutions. Is not this to Tyrannize and Lord it over Mens Consciences, and to outdo the *Romish Church* it self? For they, arrogating a Power, not only of declaring, but making new *Creeds* and new *Articles* of *Faith*, have added Twelve more, making Twenty Four in all; but the *Presbyterians* by imposing this qualifi'd Subscription, multiply them to Twelve Score, if there be so many Positions in that Confession.

3*tio.* They require of us Uniformity, in their Worship as it is now Preach'd and Practis'd by them, to which we cannot Conform with a good Conscience. There are several Tenets and Dogma's Characteristically distinguishing the Presbyterians from us, which we cannot Preach: There are some necessary, if not Essential, parts of Publick Worship cast off, or excluded by their Universal Practice, which we of the Episcopal Clergy cannot, in Umformity to them, in Conscience omitt. We cannot discharge the Reading of the *Holy Scriptures* in our Churches, for the Edification of the unlearned that cannot, of labouring Poor that want Leasure, and may

not

not, and many others that do not Read them at Home. We cannot Discharge the Singing of *Glory* to the *Blessed Trinity*, that most Ancient and Christian *Hymne*, and Indisputably Divine; tho we know what paine were taken some Years ago (for Uniformities sake) to banish it out of *Lady-Yesther's-Church*, in so much, that some of the *Town-Guard* of *Edinburgh* were at last Required to help Forward that *Godly-Reformation*. Much less can we Exclude the *Lords-Prayer* out of our Publick Devotion, which Our *Saviour* Taught and Commanded us to say, when we Pray; *We must rather obey GOD than Man*. We cannot deny *Baptism* to a weak or dying Infant, that cannot be brought to *Church*, nor yet the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper* to a Dying Christian, who Earnestlie desires it. We think it necessary to Commemorate at Sett Times the *Nativity*, *Circumcision*, *Passion*, *Resurrection* and *Ascension of our LORD* and the *Descent* of the *Holy Ghost*, &c. That these and other Mysteries of our Redemption may be preserved in Memory, the People better Instructed in them and dulie affected with them: But none of all these must we do, after our Subscribing an Uniformity with them: At *Baptism* we must not Rehearse the *Apostolick Creed*, and Bind Parents to bring up their Children in that Faith contained more largely in the *Holy-Scriptures*, whereof that *Creed* is a Summary: No, but we must give their *Confession* and *Catechisms* the Place and Preference, else be Reckoned and Deposed as *Erroneous and Unsound Men*. And who knows, but, by Vertue of this Uniformity, we must forbear to bow our Knee to GOD for the Assistance of his Grace, and the Acceptance of our Persons and Services, when we Enter the Pulpit? to stand at *Prayer*, and to Uncover the Head in time of *Preaching*, when we happen to be *Hearers*? To forbear to Kneel at the *LORDS Table*, which many think the most Humble and Becoming Gesture at the participation *of these Holy and Tremendous Mysteries*? nay perhaps, we must be Bound to own either Expresly or Virtually the very *League and Covenant* it self, For, by an Implicite Faith, we must promise to conform to whatsoever the Kirk shall afterwards Authorize and Ordain.

Thus, by the Sinfull Rigorous Conditions Required by them of *Episcopal Ministers*, they make themselves the Causes of the Separation, and lay a necessity upon us of holding a distinct Communion from them.

As to the *People of our Perswasion*, tho all the foresaid *Terms* be not imposed on them, yet certain it is that they are not satisfied in what concerns themselves in holding Communion with them. And it is a most presumptuous and *Pharisaical Pride* in the *Presbyterians* to Represent themselves as the only *Men of Conscience* in this Nation, as if all that differ from them were not acted by *Principle and Perswasion*, but only by *Interest*, *Humour or Self-Will*. The very Commons are Extreamly sensible of the Notable De-

fects in the *Presbyterian Worship*, such as are, their not Reading Publickly *the Holy Scriptures*, even without a *Gloss*, and in the Judgement of the *Apostle St. James Bishop of* Jerusalem *Publick Reading is very sound Preaching*; *Moses*, saith he, *Of Old Time hath in every City them that Preach Him*, being *Read* in the *Synagogues* every Sabbath-Day, *Acts*, 15. 21. So, their not saying the *Lord's-Prayer*, in a Deliberate Disobedience to his Command, as if that Portion of the *Holy-Gospel* were to be Antiquated and for ever Buried in Oblivion. Likewise their not singing the *Doxology* to the *Blessed-Trinity*, as if a Reason could be Assigned why, *Glory to GOD, Father Son* and *Holy-Ghost* ought to be said in Prose; But may not Lawfully be Sung in *Meeter*: And yet, which is worse, these good Men use neither to Sing or Say it in Express Words. And then, their taking such Obligations of Parents for their Children at Baptism, which smell Rankly of binding them over to a *Sect and Party*, and not of making them true *Members of the Catholick Church* and Disciples *of Jesus CHRIST*. What else Imports their laying aside the *Christian Creed* formerly used in the Church, and (by all Confessions) clearly contained in the *Word of GOD*, which is the Rule of our Faith, and instead thereof, their Binding Parents and Children to their *Westminster Confession* and the *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*? Beside all this,

The more Knowing and Judicious in the Kingdom, see through their vain pretences for a *Parity*, the Falshood of their *peculiar Tenets*, and observe many Things in their *Doctrine*, which they cannot approve, and hear many Petitions in which they cannot Join, sometimes Imprecations against such as they Judge their Enemies and Troublers of their quiet. And how can they Join in Receiving the *Holy Communion* from them, who look upon Men of *Episcopal Principles* and all that took the *Test*, as *Heathens* and *Publicans*? and will needs have them Declare their *Repentance* for these *pretended Crimes*? Yea many scruple the Lawfulness of their *Ministrations*, because of the Doubtfulness of their *Ordination* and *Authority* to Exerce them. And the greatest Length that in the Judgement of Charity they come, is to think that what is performed by them, is done *valide sed non licite*: and this is most especially to be understood of the *Scotish Presbyterians*, who might have *Episcopal* Ordination, and yet despise and Reject it. And it is observable that some *Presbyterians* have been Re-ordained by *Bishops*, but never any complying *Episcopal* Minister by *Presbyterians*.

By all which it may be easily seen what great Reason we of the *Episcopal Persuasion* both Ministers and People, have not to Join in the *Presbyterian* Communion and Worship, and that a *Toleration* is highly necessary.

His first Argument for no necessity of a *Toleration* being Answered.

To the 2d Pag. 4. (wherein he appeals to Our Consciences, if the things wherein we and they Differ, are not, and have been still reckoned Indifferent.)

different.) Its Answered Negatively, The Matters wherein we differ from Presbyterians, neither are, nor ever were reckon'd Indifferent by us; as is manifest to any that duely pondereth what is above said.

To the 3d. ibid. *Asserting there are no penal Laws now against Dissenters and therefore a Toleration should neither be desired nor given.* Its Answered, Its penal enough for Ministers Legally and Ecclesiastically Settled in in their Churches, to be cast out by Insolent Rables without a legal Hearing, and afterwards never to receive a Redress of the Wrong, nor so much as Liberty to Exerce their *Ministry* whereunto they are Called, and Penal also to the People, to be deprived of the Ministers of their own Principles and Likeing, and Approbation. And when there is a Competition between two different Churches, Men are bound to choose the Communion of the best and purest. And if there be no Penal Laws against us, then the severe Proceedings of the Presbyterians against us these bygone Years, for our Perswasion, are very Arbitrary and Unaccountable; but of this afterwards.

To the 4th. Ibid. *That the People of* Scotland *cannot Scruple, do not refuse to join with them, and a Toleration, in this case, can ease the Consciences of none.* What a Slender, yea False Proof is this? Had not the Author as good come to downright Begging the Cause, as to pretend to maintain it with Confident Assertions? The Grounds and Reasons already Exhibited, why we cannot in Conscience join with the Presbyterians, sufficiently demonstrat the Falsehood of all that is said to the contrary. And if he can produce as good and weighty Reasons for their Separating formerly from our Communion and Worship, we shall readily acquit him and his adherents from the Guilt of Schism. And whereas he expresly affirms, *That all the aim of a Toleration is to furnish a Maintenance to Episcopal Ministers*; He Tacitely acknowledges there are many in the Kingdom willing to affoord it, that they may enjoy the benefit of their Ministry.

To the 5th. Ibid, *That its utterly unnecessary with respect to Ministers, there being above a Hundred Indulged by Law to continue in their Churches: And are not their Terms of Assuming Others most easie and Condescending?* To the first part its Answered, Like Reasons should produce the like or same Determinations, *ubi par ratio, idem statuendum est.* If it was not unlawful to continue a Hundred Episcopal Ministers in their Legal Rights, it is far less so, to Tolerat their *Brethren* who have liv'd peaceably these 14 Years, divested of their Churches and Benefices: And, its humbly conceiv'd, the Honour and Justice of the Nation is concern'd in it. As to the other, *The Easiness of the Terms*, &c. The Reader is desired to consider what is above said concerning the *Terms of Communion* required of *Episcopal Ministers*, and then Judge whether they are not such as in their own Nature,

have

have an Aptitude and Tendency, rather to hold us without Doors, than to admit us in. It's too bare fac'd for this Author to talk of *their Willingness to receive us*; whereas, all along since the *Revolution*, they have declared their Aversion thereunto, both by Word and Deed. Their unjust and cruel Proceedings against many *Complying Ministers* are not yet forgotten, the Processes are still extant. And how unworthily have some been Treated that went over to them? Some harassed for a considerable space, before they yeilded to their Settlement in Cures: Others are not yet provided Witness, Mr. *Hercules Lindsay*: Some have been Scandalously defam'd by that Party, and, upon Complaint made to the *Presbytrie*, no Satisfaction was given, tho' the Falsehood of the Calumies did evidently appear: Which Indignity contributed to shorten the Life of a Minister near to *Edinburgh*, who (saving his Frailty in joyning with that Fraternity, which he did lament) was known to be a Blameless, Pious and Worthy Pastor. Others again have been put upon Invidious hateful Services, such as to declare the Churches of Episcopal Ministers Vacant, to Inform, Lybel, or Witness against them: And all this, either out of Malice to expose and disgrace these *Unhappy Proselytes*, or out of Policy, to make them more firm for the Future to the *Good Old Cause*.

Mr. *James Lundie*.

His next Argument, pag. 4. is, *That a Toleration would be highly Inconvenient*, because, *saith he*,

1mo. *It will be so far from healing Breaches, that it would increase them with all their bad Effects.* Answered, This in Reason cannot be pretended, That Men of known peaceable Principles and Deportment, and oblig'd with the signal Favour of a Liberty of Worshiping GOD in their own Method, without Molestation or Disturbance, should become what formerly they were not, Petulant and Troublesome: Freedom from Restraint and Persecution upon the account of Religion usually reduceth Unquiet and turbulent Spirits to some Calmness and better Behaviour; But if this Author and his adherents really intend (as it is too likely) to raise Mobs and molest the Indulged Party of the Kingdom, it is easie for them to prognosticat such Disorders. No, but he will needs have them to proceed from us; *For*, saith he, *The very Expectation of a Toleration has already occasioned those of the Episcopal persuasion to separat from their Communion and commit Disorders in sundry places*: What these Disorders are he tells us not, *& dolus latet in generalibus*; But sure I am, they are not so gross as those lately committed at *Glasgow*: Had it been so, it had been told us in both our Ears. But what wonder of the Prelatists starting aside from the Presbyterian Preachers? Is this any more then the Presbyterians did, Deserting the Episcopal Ministers upon the *Grant* of King *James's Toleration*? This is an Evidence, That what

what Conformity the Episcopals gave, was not of Choice, but Necessity: And a great Argument, That it is highly Convenient, to grant them a *Toleration*, that they may have Pastors of their own Principles and Approbation, to Minister to them in Holy things.

2*do.* But this (saith he) *Would occasion high Irritation of Humours, imbittering of Spirits, Factious Practices, &c.* It is too like, I grant, it might excite the Passions, sowr and imbitter the Spirits of the Presbyterian party, who are never known to be in Humour, or at peace with their Neighbours, but when they Command all, and get their Will and way in every thing, and hardly then either. Tho one would think, that a *Constraint* in Matters of Religion, should rather imbitter Mens Spirits, than a *Toleration.* However it happen to others, sure I am, it will sweeten and ease the Spirits of those of the Episcopal Perswasion; And 'tis hoped, the Honourable Court of Parliament will not subject so considerable and peaceable a part of the Subjects of this Kingdom to the Caprice and Peevish Humour of their fellow Subjects. But,

3*tio.* He saith, *A Toleration would open a Gape to a deludge of Errours, Miscarriages and Scandals, and ruine the Discipline of the Church.* Did they fear that this would be the bad Consequences of King *James* his *Toleration*, if so, how came they to embrace it? when they knew the Favour was mainly intended for the Popish party, to pave a way for the Introduction of the *Romish* Religon. Again, Did they not in their Representation to the High Commissioner and Estates of Parliament, *May* 30. 1695, declare, That all kind of Wickedness did exceedingly abound? And did not a Reverend Minister in *Edinburgh* declaming, not without Cause, against the atrocious Crimes committed in the Land, and enumerating their several Kinds, such as Atheism, Bestiality, Incest, Adultery, conclude that black Roll with these Words, yea, *Italian Sins.* These Heinous Transgressions, sure are not Chargeable upon a Toleration, but rather upon the not allowing one to Episcopal Ministers, the granting whereof would, in all humane Probability, prevent the like for the Future. Has not many Congregations since this late Revolution wanted a Pastor and Watch-man to Instruct and Inspect them? And in too many places how rarely is the Holy Communion given to the People? Some have been so supinely Negligent both *South* and *North*, that it has not been given for Eight or Nine Years, and in some places, particularly the Town of *Aberdeen*, not at all. And no wonder that People should return to *Paganism*, at least to the Perpetration of Crimes not to be named among *Christians*. There is no just ground to fear then that Vice and Immoralities would increase by granting a Toleration, while the Ministers are invested with power to exercise Discipline, and the people willing to submit to their Censures; which may be reasonably concluded from the Example of the *Episcopal Ministers* yet possessing their *Churches*,

who never yet sought nor needed the Assistance of the Secular Arm to curb the Irregularities of their People. Yet,

4to. He saith, *A Toleration would be highly Inconvenient, for it would perpetuat the Differences that are amongst us, which otherways in time would be utterly Obliterated.* To this it may be reasonably Answered, *First*, This Argument, like others preceeding, stricks against all Liberty to Dissenters for publick Worship, and was as good and valid against the Presbyterians formerly, as against us now, and yet they were Tolerated and Indulged. But, *2do.* we Answer, That no tract of Time is likely to raze out of the Minds of Knowing and Conscientious Persons, a Perswasion so well grounded, as that of *Episcopacy* is: Nor, that Parents, Masters, and such as Educate the Youth, will be wanting to Instruct and Breed up their Children, Servants, and Puples in their own Principles and Perswasion. Whereas that *new start up Opinion*, with the Tenets belonging thereunto, had been near forgot by this time in all Likelyhood, had the Church continued in its Establishment, and the People been kept in a due Subjection to Government and Order. The Practice of the Presbyterian Ministers and People holding Communion with us in publick Worship after the Re-establishment of *Episcopacy*, untill the Year 1666, and the Conformity of the *Western Shires*, towards the end of K. *Ch* 2*d*'s Reign, do sufficiently manifest this.

5*th*. He Affirms, *That if after all that's said, a Toleration be still pressed, then the Introduction of Prelacy is necessarly intended and designed; there being* (as he pretends) *a necessary Connexion between the Granting the one, and the Re-establishment of the other.* Certainly this Inference is peculiarly his own, and the product of his Jealousie and Unreasonable Suspicion, rather than of Good Logick. Who ever thought that the Tolerating an Opinion or Perswasion in any Nation, necessarly inferred the legal Authorizing and Establishing the same? Do they in *England* think so, who Tolerat all Dissenters, except *Papists*? Or they in *Holland*, who Tolerat all kind of Sects? Or did we so conceive it, when Presbytrie was Tolerated in our time; we were so far from apprehending any such necessary Connexion, that we never opened our Mouths against it; Yea, does he think that *Henry* the 4*th*. of *France* with his Bishops and States-men, judged so, when he granted the Ample Edict of *Nants* in favours of all his Protestant Subjects, dispersed over all his Dominions? Which Liberty granted to Protestants in a vast Popish Kingdom, may shame our Presbyterians, that will by no means allow a *Toleration* to their fellow Subjects of the same *Reformed Religion* with themselves.

But he offers a Reason for this imagined Connexion, these Tolerated Presbyters (saith he) must be Subject unto Bishops, for without them (according to their Principles) they have no order nor Government:

Now,

Now, these must either be *English* Bishops, and that would really fortify their Claim, particularly of the Bishops of *Canterburry* and *York*, who have pretended to a Jurisdiction over this Nation, and this were to Enslave *Scotland* to *England*. But what if we should say, that in this case we were only to be Subject to our own Surviving *Scotish* Bishops, to whom we owe Canonical Obedience? *Why? then saith he, this is a manifest Encroachment upon the Claim of Right.* But under Favour, it will not be found so; for the *Claim of Right*, with what followed thereupon, has only deprived our Bishops of the Protection of the State, of their *Secular Encouragements, Privileges* and *Revenues*, but has not divested them of their Spiritual Powers as Christian Bishops, derived to them from Christ and his Church, and which the primitive Bishops exercised, when they had not the Protection and Countenance of the Secular Powers. And we humbly conceive, it can give no Offence to the Government, that the Dutiful Sons of our Church, consult their Spiritual Fathers, and submit themselves unto them.

In the next place, he comes to propose and Answer some Objections, which he forsees may be justly made against him. Let us hear them, and how he solves them.

The first is this, *Dissenters in* England *enjoy a Toleration, and why may not those of the Episcopal Perswasion be allowed the same in* Scotland? To this he Answers, There are three Discrepancies in the case of the *English* Dissenters, which the *Scotish* Prelatists cannot pretend to in theirs.

First, *They are Straitned in their Consciences, and have Exhibited the particular Grounds and Reasons why they cannot Join with the Church of* England: *which* (saith he) *Those we have to do with here cannot pretend.* What a goodly Confidence is this? Is it not manifest that this is our Case, with advantage of the *English* Dissenters in this Point? We have Exhibited the particular Grounds and Reasons why we cannot in Conscience Join with the Presbyterians, and let the Impartial Reader Seriously Consider the forementioned Terms of Communion required by them of us, and then Judge whither we have not Greater Reason to be Straitned in our Consciences to Join with the present Presbyterians, than the *English* Dissenters have to Join with the Church of *England*: Our Scruples being about Matters of greater Moment and Importance, than those of the *English* Dissenters concerning the Ceremonies of that Church, which (as he saith) are Acknowledged to be but things Indifferent.

A 2d. Difference Assigned by him is this; The *Dissenters* in *England* were under severe penal Statutes, and a Vigorous Execution of them for their *Non-Conformity*; But it is not so with those of the Episcopal Perswasion in *Scotland*. That severe Laws are not Enacted and Vigorously Executed a-

gainst

gainſt us, we owe not to the Temper and Goodwill of that Party, but to the Favour and Juſtice of the *Civil-Powers*, who, conſidering what *Barbarous Uſage* we had met with from *that People* in the Years 1688 and 1689, thought it not fit to Subject a Society of *Peaceable Suffering Men* to their mercileſs Humour, in time coming. The *Temper* and *Spirit* of that *Tribe* is too well known; they gave a goodly *ſpecimen* of it, when the *Solemn League* lifted up its Head on High: then it was, that they made the Scaffolds Reek with the Blood of *Loyal Subjects*, at which one of their Preachers could ſay, *The Work was going bonnily on.* And when the *Government* at that time would not conſent to the Shedding of more, then a Propoſal was made in the Kirk Conſiſtory, *Shame them and Herry them*, i. e. *Excommunicate their Perſons and Sequeſtrate their Eſtates.* But tho there were no penal Laws againſt us; Yet that freed us not from ſuffering, (as he boldly aſſerts) and that meerly for Diſſenting, and upon the Account of our Perſwaſion, as is well known to this Nation. Did they not, in purſuance of the Acts of *Parliament* Eſtabliſhing their Government, *Convean* many of us before their *Judicatories*, bring forth Libels againſt us without an Accuſer, ſuſtain them tho Calumnious, and ſo thruſt us out of our Churches, maugre all the Proteſtations of the Pariſhioners to the contrary? Did they not procure ſome to be Impriſoned, others to be Baniſhed, that kept Meeting-Houſes? Did they not, as if they had been the Council's Delegat's, turn out ſome Miniſters meerly for not having Qualified to the Civil Government? Not to mention what they procured to be done to ſome honeſt People, for appearing in behalf of their Miniſters, that they might not be deprived of them, tho' otherwiſe they neither did, nor offered Violence to any that came on that Earand. Did they not, to blacken and Render us Odious, in all their publick Faſts charge us as the Cauſes of all the Judgements Incumbent on the Land? Reckoning *Prelacy* and its Abettors, (as the *Iſraelites* did the Sin of the *Golden-Calf*) the firſt and principal Ingredient and procuring Cauſe of all thoſe heavy and afflictive Viſitations, under which the Kingdom groaned. Did they not procure twenty *Merks* for each Sunday's Service, to be paid to their Itinerant Preachers out of the Vacancies on the North-ſide of *Tay*, that there might be no Fund left out of which we might be Relieved by our *Compaſſionat Rulers?* And what pains and care was taken by them, both in *Town* and *Country*, that all the Poſts of the Kingdom might be filled with Men of their own *Principles* and *Party*, that every where they might have ſome *Zealots* to Diſturb and Interrupt our ſmall conniv'd at Liberty? On conſideration of all which (and the half is ſcarce told) Its highly reaſonable to deliver us from their Tyranny.

His 3d Difference reſpects our *Scotiſh* Presbyterians themſelves. The

Church

Church of England (*saith he*) *is better secured then we are. 'Tis provided by Law, that the King or Queen shall be of the* English *Church, and that all Officers Civil and Military shall be of that Communion: So that they have not the least Reason to fear any Prejudice from their Dissenters; but it is not so with us, else we would not fear a Toleration, having the like special Provisions.* One would think, Sir, this look'd like a worldly Argument, the good Men are afraid to lose their Churches and Benefices, secure them, once in that, and they'l comply with a *Toleration*: For you must know, they are not so much Self-deny'd, but that they naturally care for and seek their own things as well as the things of *Jesus Christ*: But now, of both these they are secured by the Laws made, both in the last and present Reign; and how unaccountable then is their Jealousie and Fear of the Subversion of their Government, and losing their Livelyhoods by means of a *Toleration?* For it is Evident by what is above said, that there is no necessary Connexion between a *Toleration* of Episcopal Men and the Re-establishment of *Episcopacy* it self. To this I add, If the Foundamental Charter of Presbytrie be true, that the Inclinations of the whole Nation generally are for it, what place is there for this Fear? What ground to doubt their enjoying their Churches and Benefices? Will not the Authority of the Nation protect and support the Preachers of their own choise, Approbation and likeing? But after all, if their Fear be real, and not palliat and disguis'd, that a *Toleration* will, at long run, justle them out, then its manifest, they themselves never believed that the Generality of the Nation was for them; but only thought it their Interest to have it so declar'd and believed by others: And then no wonder they should dread the Tottering of that building, which they know, hath but a sandy and uncertain Foundation.

The next Objection is this, *The Presbyterians in* Scotland *had an Indulgence and Toleration granted to them by King* Ch. *the* 2d. *and K.* Ja. 7th. *and therefore it but Reasonable that we of the Episcopal Perswasion should have the same Liberty granted to us by Her present Majesty Queen* ANN. This he mekes a *Non sequitur*, and will not allow a Parity of Reasoning in Matters of Favour from the Presbyterians to Prelatists; and in this he receds not a jot from the Humour of the Gang: For it is the known Temper and Practice of that People, to accept Quarter gladly when they are at Mercy, but to grant none when they have the upperhand. To fortify his Assertion, he offers two Considerations.

First, That the *Indulgence already granted to Episcopal Ministers, yet possessing Churches and Benefices, doth not only equal, but far surmount the Indulgence granted to them by K.* Ch. *the* 2d. But can he say, That it doth equal, yea far exceed the *Toleration* granted by K. *Ja. the 7th?* Did it not

not extend to every Town and Parish throw-out the Kingdom, and why may not the like Favour be extended to us, if it shall seem good to the Queen and Honourable *Court of Parliament*? Besides, there is this Disparity in the Case between us now and the Presbyterians then, That in beginning of K. *Ch.* the 2d's Restauration, a few Ministers in the Western Shires (a few, I say, comparatively to the Body of the Clergy within the Kingdom, who submitted to Episcopacy) were turned out by Law, or rather, by their own Obstinacy turned out themselves; but now the whole Clergy throughout the Nation (a few excepted) are laid aside, and therefore 'tis Reasonable that the Liberty granted to them be more extensive than the Indulgence of K. Ch. 2d. And it's well known, they had both *Indulgence* and *Toleration* upon very easie *Terms*, without any Oaths, tho this Gentleman insinuates the quite contrary.

His 2d. Consideration is very Calumnious, but unreasonable, containing many Grievances, whereof we have no cause to complain, as he thinks. For they were required to renunce their *Solemn Covenants*, into which they they had entred with GOD. And this he would have believed to be a Grievous force upon their *Consciences*. But I would ask, where their *Indulged Ministers* oblig'd to this, as a condition of their *Indulgence*? This in Truth cannot be affirmed. *2do.* Was there no Provocatiou given to the Government, both before and after these *Indulgences* by their Seditious Practices, which might justifie such a Renunciation? Yes, that is not to be denyed, they had often rebelled and made many Insurrections. Well! Then *3tio.* I ask, how far were they required to renunce these *Covenants*? Was it not only in so far as, they thought these *Covenants* did infer an Obligation on them to rise in Arms against the King and Government? And what State could require less from Men of such Rebellious Principles and Practices, for its own Security? O! but (saith he) *other unlawful Oaths were imposed upon them*, which since he doth not Name, I'le not vex my Head about them; only I remember they were indeed required to swear, That they judged it unlawful to kill any that served under the Government, either in a Civil, Ecclesiastick or Military Capacity. And, who, but he that owns Principles destructive of humane Society, will call that an unlawful Oath? Did not their Declarations at *Sanchar*, *Lanerk*, *Queensferry*, and Papers affixed to Church-Doors, all in one Night, declaring it their bounden Duty to do so, give rise to these Oaths, and Sanguinary Laws, of which they Complain? And in consequence to these Declarations they began to cut off some Soldiers, and Mr. *Pearson* Minister of *Corsesairne*, besides Mr. *Lowson* at *Irengray*, and many others that were grievously wounded; so that it was absolutely necessary to put some stop to their Rampant Wickedness, without which our Governours

vernours had been Cruel to Loyal & peaceable Subjects; whereas we having lived peaceable and quietly; 'ts no wonder that we have not suffered as Evil Doers, Penal Statutes being made for the *Lawless* and *Disobedient*.

In the next place he seems to be very Angry, and ready to cudgel us into a submission to *Presbytry*, asking, *with what Credit or Conscience can we Refuse to join them, upon the Account of Government?* For,

First, *Was it not our known and constant Doctrine, while Episcopacy was Established, that it is utterly unlawfull to separat from any Church, upon Account of Mods and Forms of Government?* And, *was it not our Principle with the Learned Dr.* Stillingfleet *and others, that the Government of the Church is Ambulatory?*

It has been already made appear, that we of the *Episcopal Perjwasion* cannot in Conscience Join with the *Presbyterians*; To his Objections adduced against this, I shall Answer distinctly to each of them. And to the

First, Our former Doctrine of no Separation, upon Account of Forms of *Government*, makes nothing against us, who always understood that *Separation* to be meant from a Church duely Constitute, according to *JESUS CHRIST*'s Institution, consisting of *true Bishops and Pastors*, as ours was at that time; but we never meant, if *Schismaticks* should prevail against a well Constitute Orthodox Church, getting themselves set up in its Place; That the said *depress persecuted Church* should forthwith Join and Incorporate with them: which is the Case betwixt us and the present *Presbyterians*. They have got by ways and means the *Episcopal Clergy* turned out, and themselves possessed of their Churches and Livings; And now they cry out, *with what Credit or Conscience can you decline to Join with us, according to your own Doctrine?* Is it not Evident, that this unreasonable Out-cry, is founded upon an Ignorant or willfull Misunderstanding of our Doctrine and Sentiments in this Matter? For we never thought their Novel Institution of a *Parity* to be the *True Government of the Church*, much less that 50 Men and such as they should assume, have a *True Church Power* and *Spiritual Jurisdiction* over all the Ministers of the late Established Church. If in the last Century, the *publict Resolutioners* had obtained an Act of Parliament Establishing the Church Government in their hands, would the *Protesters* have submitted to them? no surely: How then can they Expect or Require, That we of the Episcopal Perswasion should grant to the present Presbyterians, what they would not formerly yeild to one another? Or blame us for not joining with them, who disowned our Ministrations? Our Title to their Submission and concurrence in Worship, being fully as good then, to say no more, as any they can pretend to at this day, with Respect to us.

To the 2d. *That we hold the Government of the Church to be Ambulatory*, it's *gratis dictum*: And I presume, if he were better acquaint with our Principles and the Grounds of them, he would acknowledge his mistake, if he be a good Man, and not obstinate in his own way. Let him but consider the Writings of Episcopal Ministers in this Kingdom, concerning the Subject of an *Authoritative Episcopacy* above *Presbyters*, which we own, and then say, if he can, that we hold the Government of the Church to be *Ambulatory*. Yea, the Subordination of Church Men to their *Superiours* the *Bishops*, appears so Evident to us from the very Sacred Books of the *New-Testament*, setting aside all other Writings, that we think none, but such as are obstinatly Prejudicat, can deny it. For there we find, Our *Blessed LORD* Instituted an *Imparity* among *Church-Men*, which, being never Repealed, was designed to continue to the End of the World. And the Practice of the *Apostles*, and of the *Catholick-Church*, immediatly from the Apostles Time, is a strong Confirmation of this. And so strong it is, that what is said by the *Presbyterians* against the continuance of this *Imparity* in the *Church of Christ*, doth strike as Forcibly against the continuance of a *standing Ministry*. For, as the *Presbyterians* say that *Imparity* of *Church-Men* was extraordinary, and only to continue for a time, but not by Succession in all Ages; so say the *Quakers* and other Sectaries of a *Standing Ministry*: After the pouring out of the Spirit, all the Lords People (say they) turn Prophets, *&c.* And so, there being no use for a standing Ministry, and Order of Men to Teach, *&c.* it ceaseth. If the *Presbyterians* Answer hold good against the one, why not the *Quakers* against the other?

We, then, who Entertain this Principle on such solid Grounds, and suffer for it, cannot in Reason be Reputed to hold, *Episcopacy* to be *indifferent and Ambulatory*. Yea, we think, that Heresies, Schisms, Confusion and Tyranny rise in a Church, where *Bishops* are not, or if they be, yet are not obeyed. And the Considerarion and fore-sight of this, made that worthy Reformer *Melanchton* say, *Utinam possem Administrationem Restituere Episcoporum, video enim qualem habituri sumus Ecclesiam, Ecclesiastica Politia dissoluta, video futuram tyrannidem multo intolerabiliorem, quam unquam fuit in Ecclesia.* i. e. Would to GOD it lay in my power, to Restore the Government of Bishops; For I see what kind of Church we shall have, the Ecclesiastick Policy being dissolved, I see we shall have a much more *intollerable Tyranny*, than has been heretofore in the Church. *Hist: Confess: Augusti: p.* 365.

Neither was Dr *Stillingfleet* of another Judgement. 'Tis true, in his Younger Years, to serve the Church of *England*, he wrote an *Irenicum*, a Discourse for Pacification and gaining the Dissenting Parties to the said

Church

Church; For Effecting this, he thought there was no neceſſity for him or any Church-Man among them, to inſiſt too nicely upon a ſtrict *Jus Divinum* of *Epiſcopacy*; But that it was ſufficient for thoſe of that Church, and the Deſign he had in hand, if it were proved to be the moſt Ancient and agreeable to *Apoſtolical* Practice, and moſt accomodat to the Laws and Civil Government of that Kingdom: And there could be no pretence againſt ſubmitting to it, but the demonſtrating its unlawfulneſs, which he knew was impoſſible to be done. And, ſince he has declared this to be the deſign of his Book, both at the beginning and concluſion of it, how can he be ſaid, to own *Epiſcopacy* to be *Indifferent and Ambulatory*, and ſo *undermine* that Church, which he *aimed to Serve?* And, if he was miſtaken in the means he took with theſe Diſſenters, and ſaid ſome things, which ſhew his Youth and want of due Conſideration, he made amends for it afterwards in his Writtings, and defended the Cauſe of that Church in all points, againſt Adverſaries of all ſorts.

There remains yet another terrible Argument, in which he Triumphs, as if we were not able to ſtand before it, but muſt either *yeild the Cauſe*, or be *Guilty of Perjurie*, and it is this; *By Acts of Parliament and Oaths, particularly that of the Teſt, its own'd, That it is the Magiſtrates Prerogative to order and diſpoſe of the Government of the Church: And we have ſworn to own and maintain all the Prerogatives of the Crown, and therefore are bound to own Presbyterian Government eſtabliſhed by the Laws both of the preſent and laſt Reign; if we would not Involve our ſelves in the Guilt of Perjury.*

Who would have expected ſuch a Charge from Presbyterians againſt the Prelatiſts, upon account of the *Teſt*? Is it not amazing, That we who took it, and thereby were ſworn againſt *Popery* on the one hand, and *Phanaticiſm* on the other, and againſt the pretended Obligation of the *Solemn League* to riſe in Arms againſt the *King* and *Government* (in which principle many think, the greateſt Strength and Security of the *Covenanted Presbyterians* lyeth) That we, I ſay, ſhould nevertheleſs be eſteemed bound, by that very Oath of the Teſt, to join with thoſe, whom our Laws at that time ſtiled *Phanaticks*. Is it poſſible that he is ſerious in this? If that Oath was ſo favourable for his Party how came they to be, and continue ſuch bitter Enemies to it, and to all that took it? upon my ſincerity, I know none that took it, who ever dreamed it had ſuch a binding Quality; but rather judg'd it a great Security (if Oaths can tye Men) to the, then, eſtabliſhed Government, both of Church and State: Yet this Gentleman would make it a *Delphick Oracle*, to bear different Senſes, and to bind to Contrarieties.

The *Magiſtrats Prerogative* and *Power* in the External Government of the Church, as owned by us in the *Teſt*, cannot infer our joining with

 Presbytrie,

Presbyterians, for *Conscience* and our *Oaths* sake: The *King* never requiring nor we promising to own every Form, that His Majesty or Royal Successors should be pleased to set up, as the true Government of the Church of Christ. And whether the Words, *Ordering and Disposing*, be the very same with, *Altering and Changing*, I will not offer to dispute; but this I can confidently say, That the Laws then declared *Episcopal Government* to be most agreeable to the *Word of GOD*, and most accomodat to *Monarchy*, which his Majesty would unalterably preserve: And, agreeable to this, the Explanation of the *Test*, published by the *King* and his *Council*, before we took that Oath, declared, That no Incroachment was made or intended upon the *Intrinsick Power* of the *Church*, but that the *Power* of the *Keyes*, as exercised for the first three Centuries, were entirely reserved to the Church. So that we are free from Perjury, tho not from Injury; but better to suffer than sin.

Having done with his Reasoning, he proceeds to Railing *a Ratione ad Rixas*, Charging us all as *Enemies* to the Civil Government. But wherein doth this appear? Have we been leading out Multitudes of Armed Men to the Fields, or Mountains? Or blowing the Trumpet of Sedition and Rebellion? Excommunicating Princes? Emitting Declarations asserting the Nullity of their Titles? Discharging the payment of Taxes? Proclaiming War against King or Queen, and all that serve under them? And in Consequence to this, cutting off those we could come at? No, 'tis Confess'd the Men of our Principles have not courage for these things, they belong only to the Men of *tender Consciences* in the Land. But we are Enemies for all that; for we *are still concerned for K.* James *the* 8th, *and to prepare Matters for another Revolution.* How makes he this appear? I'm sure those who are thus concern,d never told him so much, how then presumes he to judge the Secrets of Men's Heart's? *de Interna non Judicat Ecclesia.* O! but (saith he) *In their Families yea and Meeting-Houses, They pray for the King, Queen* Dowager, *and the Generous Prince that Maintains them.* For what is done in Men's Private Families, I cannot Account, nor was I ever so impertinently curious and inquisitive to know: It is the part of *busy-Bodies*, whom St. *Peter*, Reckons up with great Criminals, to be inquiring into Men's Secretest Actions, medling with things that concern them not, *nosse secreta domus.* But that we pray thus Explicitely in Meeting-Houses, this Author will never be able to make good, without the Assistance of *Knights of the Post*: It was never our Practice to dare Authority to its Face: Yet he thinks the Charge will serve his turn, to Irritat the Government against us, *Calumniare Audacter, aliquid Adhærebit*, there will still be found some so easie as to believe, there is some Ground for the Accusation.

His

His Rancour and ill will Prompts him to Lybell the Addreſſers in particular, *as bearing but a ſeeming Reſpect to Her Majeſty, and that it was meerly want of Bread that put us upon Addreſſing Her, that we are ſtill Men of the Old Stamp and Deſign, and therefore no Encouragement ought to be given us.* This Gentleman meaſures us by the Genius and Diſpoſition of his own party, who can profeſs Loyalty when they mean nothing leſs, as is manifeſt from their Behaviour towards King *James* the *7th.* Now how Malicious, Falſe and Uncharitable this Acculation is, let the World Judge, we have by our Addreſs given a Sufficient Evidence and Expreſſion of our Duty and Affection to Her Majeſty and Government; And for 14 Years bygon, given a great Prooff of our Meek and Peaceable Behaviour under the greateſt hardſhips, and made it appear to a Demonſtration, that there is no Seditiouſneſs in our Tempers, Principles and Doctrine. And yet we muſt be branded by this Man, as *Diſaffected and Seditious Perſons;* and that for this very end, that we may be ſtill kept in the *Furnace of afflicting miſery,* and *perſecuted to Ruine.* Theſe Men are ſo far from making any ſort of Compenſation for the Injuries they have done us, that they labour to obſtruct, by their *Calumnies* and *Slanders,* any Favour or Relief we might obtain from others. It ill becomes the *Presbyterians* to *Impeach Our Loyalty to the QUEEN,* who *gave ſo little Proof of their own to Her Royal Anceſtors;* and who by their new Aſſociations, Pulpit Declamations, daring Expreſſions in their Pamphlets, and Backwardneſs to qualify themſelves, *&c.* give a *ſhrewd ſuſpicion of their Diſaffection* to Her Preſent Majeſty, whatſoever they may craftily pretend to the contrary.

He falls foul next on the *Addreſs* it ſelf, which all knowing and impartial Men have Accounted both Dutiful and Modeſt. And had he and his Friends been in our Circumſtances, and undergone ſuch Treatment from thoſe of our Perſwaſion, as we did from them; I mightily Doubt, if ſo much of a Meek and Chriſtian Spirit had appeared in any *Addreſs* from them. *Yet we were* (*ſaith he*) *unaccountaly Bold and Affronted the Supreme Authority of the Nation, in calling our ſelves the National Church.* But I will ask him, was not his Party as Unaccountably Bold, when they Wrot an Hiſtory of the Sufferings, which they ſinfully brought upon themſelves in Entituling the Pamphlet, *The Groanings of the Church of* Scotland? Was not this to Contemn and Affront the Supreme Authority of the Nation? For at that time *Epiſcopacy* was Eſtabliſhed by Law. If he ſay his Brethren were Faulty in ſo doing, then he ſhould be wiſer than to Cenſure us, *Turpe eſt Doctori* &c. But if, as 'tis very probable, he think it no fault in them, then why ſhould it be blamed in us? If there be any Advantages to alter the Caſe, they are on our ſide, unleſs it be ſaid, that Prsbyterians can do nothing amiſs, *Quicquid libet, Licet,* which ſure I am, they will not own.

Beſides

Besides, I would ask, May there not be two *Bodies* of People in one Nation; One having the Protection and Countenance of the State, with Places and Preferments Fortified with Laws, and so an *Incorporat Church*? And the other *Great Body* wanting all these outward Encouragements, being left meerly to *its Spiritual Powers*, and so a *Persecuted Church*? This has not only happened in this and the Neighbour Nation, but likewise in many Parts of *Christendome*. Wherefore then should we be quarrelled, for doing what every Party (*Presbyterians* not excepted) do in the like Case, Namely for designing our selves the *National Church of Scotland in deplorable Circumstances*: for certain it is, this hath been our Condition, these many bygone Years.

Again he saith, *We Arraign the Claim of Right by calling Episcopacy the truely Apostolical Government of the Church, which the States Declared an insupportable Grievance to the Nation: which is to unhing the whole Constitution, and to tell the Queen that Her Title to the Crown is supported by a Foundation, that is Unchristian, and therefore cannot be maintained.* This Gentleman ever strives to stretch things too far, tho it were *per decimam nonam consequentiam*, and marvelously discovers what no Body else can discern, and in a word is so bent on Calumnie, that he is ready to infer *quid libet ex quolibet*, to wrest what is most truly and innocently spoken to the worst meaning and purpose.

The *Addressers* were so carefull that the least shadow of Offence might not be given, either to the *Queen's Majesty*, or any of our *Rulers*, that they Industriously avoided every expression that might irritat any Person or Party whatsoever, and which might Reflect upon the *standing Laws*; So far was it from their Thoughts to Arraign or Impugn any of *them*. And for all his Thundering and Furious bluster, Our calling *the Government of the Church by Bishops truely Ancient and Apostolical*, can never be supposed to infer our Arraigning the *Claim of Right*, or *Her Majesty's Title to the Crown*, as Unchristian: unless this Adversary say, That the Estates, in Declairing Episcopacy to be an *insupportable Grievance to the Nation*, declaired it *ipso facto*, to be also Unchristian, and I humbly conceive, they will not own that they meant any such thing. The *Estates* Met at that time, declaired it indeed an *Insupportable Grievance*, as to the Legal Establishment and Continuance of it, and at last Removed it; yet all the while, they abstracted from the Intrinsick Nature and Institution of it, neither declairing it to be Apostolical, nor denying it to be such: it not being their Business to determine as to the true and Intrinsick Nature of *Ecclesiastick things*. And since they did no more but declare Episcopacy a *Grievance*, we cannot be said to Arraign the *Claim*, *in Calling* that Government *Apostolical*.

Next

Next, to render us Odious, he saith, *We have most Unnaturally and Calumniously loaded our Native Country with the Horrid Murther of* Ch. *the* 1st. *in Sermons not only Preached but Printed.* Our whole *Native Country!* God forbid. The better and greater part of the Nation detested and abominat that *Execrable Villanie*, and if any of them were (rather by the Artifice and Instigation of others, than any Inclination of their own) drawn and inveigled into that *Horrid Rebellion*, which terminated in the Martyrdom of the *King*; as they found a Reluctancy then, so they have declared their Remorse since, for any the least step they made in that Engagement, and never remember that *most foul* and *detestable Fact*, without the greatest displeasure. It is only then a party in the Nation, whom they aim at in those Sermons, who being *Accessory* to the taking away the *Life* of the *King*, never yet Repented of, nor Condemn'd that *Horrid*, that *Bold* and *Insolent Sin*: And who often having the Opportunity for purging themselves of that great Guilt, could they have done it, yet never offered at it to this very day, but contrariwise have entertained the approvers of it. It was a Deed of the greatest Darkness, and no wonder that the Actors or Partakers in it, whether in this or the other Kingdom, be much offended, when they are charged with it, call it a bold and malicious Calumny, and disclaim the Guilt; But if this Gentleman will be pleased to tell me who they were in our Nation, that caused purge the Army of *Malignants* i. e. the Kings fast Friends: That carried it into *England* against the *King*: That ordered and consented to the delivering *Him* up to His Enemies, after he had cast himself upon the *Scotish Army* for Shelter. That prosecuted the Army that went in to Rescue *Him*: That protested at *London* against his being brought from the *Isle* of *Wight* to his Palace at *Whitehal* with Honour and Safety, as being a Notorious Breach of the *Solemn League and Covenant* between *Scotland* and *England*, in all the Six Articles of it: That engrossed this Protestation with the Acts of the General Assembly of the Kirk of *Scotland*: That never yet publickly condemned that *Horrid Fact*, nor yet the forsaid Hainous Accessions to it: I say, if he will be pleased to tell me, who they were, and of what party in *Scotland* that were Guilty of these things, for some such People there were, then I will assure him, that these very Men and their unrelenting Posterity are the party of the Kingdom, whom they of the Episcopal Perswasion Charge as Partakers of the *Murther* of *King* Charles 1*st*. and not the whole Nation.

After this, he Returns to the Subject of the *Toleration*, *If some*, (saith he) *shall pretend, it will be a great Satisfaction to the Queen, we crave leave to say the Queen is sadly Abused: She has often given Assurances to protect us in our Rights, &c. as by Law Established without any such thing.* Does not every Body see by this *Reply*, that he plainly prefers the gratifying his own and his Parties Humour to the Satisfaction and Pleasure of the QUEEN

and that in a matter highly Reasonable and Excellently consistent both with the practice of her Royal Ancestors, and her own Assurances given to the Presbyterians? Did not both King *Ch:* the 2*d* and King *Ja:* the 7*th* Promise to maintain the Episcopal Government as Established by Law, and yet grant Indulgence and *Toleration* to the Presbyterians? und yet no man ever Judg'd this a Breach of their Royal Promisses made to those of the Episcopal perswasion. Why then is it not as consistent with the QUEEN's Gracious Promises to the Presbyterians, to grant the Favour of a *Toleration* to us? The Case is more Favourable for us of the Episcopal perswasion, who never Provock'd the Government to deal severly with us.

This Author concludes his Letter with *bitter Invectives* against us, with *frightful Predictions of Tragical Events*, to excite his Party, and *passionate Obtestations* to induce the High Court of Parliament to oppose and Refuse a *Toleration*, and all this founded upon his Imaginary Supposition, *That it will inevitably Introduce Episcopacy*: Whereas he knows very well there's no necessary connexion between *these Two*. And since he still insists on this, give me leave to suppose, that what he so much fears, should at last fall upon him, and *Episcopacy* should come to be Established, without the prologue of a Toleration; In that Case, what danger would there be of all the Persecutions and Cruelties he Talks of, and which, he says, may be look't for from those of the *Episcopal Perswasion*? they behaving as becometh good Subjects, *who is he that will harm them if they be Followers of that which is good?* when Episcopacy was last Established, the Government never stretcht out its *Hand* against them, untill first they lifted up the *Heel* against it. And for the *Clergy*, as they never excited the *Rulers* against them, so they often Rescued them from their deserved punishments: and how unworthily they were Requited by them in these late Times, the Nation knows. And as we are now stated, we have greater Reason to be in Apprehension of Danger from that People, considering their Temper; And if the *Queen's Majesty* and *High Court of Parliament* Vouchsafe us not Protection from their Severities, we may come to find them to be *Scythians* rather than *Saints*. For the true Ground of all this Clamour against a *Toleration* is a Rooted fixt hatred, which they causelesly bear towards our Principles and Persons: And it is hoped the *Honourable Estates of Parliament* will not leave us in their hands.

However it shall happen, Sir we are stedfastly resolved, by the Grace of God, never to Lose our Duty, to behave Insolently towards our Superiours, either by telling the Queen, (as our Antagonists do) under the Form of Esther, That if she altogether hold her Peace at this time, then shall Enlargement and Deliverance arise from another place, but she and her Father's House shall be Destroyed; Nor yet the High Court of Parliament, that they will not be thrown out of their Pulpits with the Breath of a Proclamation, but will maintain their Possession, and Vim vi Repellere. *But we of our Perswasion both Clergy and Laity will quietly submit, as well becometh the Ministers of the Gospel of Peace and the Faithful Disciples of the Meek and Holy Jesus.* I am &c.

BRITISH MUSEUM 8 JU 80